

Water Use Efficiency Subcommittee

Meeting 3 Notes

May 19, 2004

SeaTac

Members:

Ben Bonkowski	Richard Gustav	Drew Noble	Frank Triplett
Greg Brizendine	Jim Haneline	(for Jerry Peterson)	Judy Turpin
Tom Clingman	(for Don Wright, am)	Kimberly Ordon	Dawn Vyvyan
(for Tom Fox)	John Kirner	Bob Pancoast	Tim Wilson
Andrew Cook	Connie Krueger	Gary Rhoades	Donald Wright, pm
(for Scott Hildebrand)	Howard Laughery	Denise Smith	
Gene Eckhardt	Shirley Nixon	Debbie Thomas	
David Fujimoto	(for Karen Allston)	Mark Tompkins	

Alternates:

Bruce Beauchene	Marla Carter	Andrew Graham	Steve Skipworth
Randy Black	Peter Dervin	Harry Paul	Betty Vance

DOH Staff & Consultants

Laird Harris	Jennifer Kropack	Jim Rioux
Cynara Lilly	Deana Pavwoski	Rich Siffert

Others:

Joan Burlingame	John Charba	Doug Levy	Danford Moore
-----------------	-------------	-----------	---------------

I. Introduction

- A. Introduction of subcommittee members, alternates, DOH staff, HSPA (Harris and Smith Public Affairs) and audience members
- B. Walk through of agenda. No changes were suggested.
- C. Explanation of minutes from April 28, 2004, meeting #2
 1. ACTION: Subcommittee members to email Jim Rioux with any proposed changes
- D. DOH plans to take photos during subcommittee meetings as part of the documentation process.
 1. ACTION: Jim will bring waiver to the next meeting

II. Explanation of 1994 CPR (Conservation Planning Requirements)

- A. Jim Rioux presented some additional background about the creation of CPR and his view of how CPR will be incorporated in the rule making process.

III. Current Data Collection Standards

- A. Jennifer presented information about data collected regarding current water use and conservation. She noted that the data was not complete enough for DOH to draw conclusions from the data set.
- B. Concern was expressed about smaller systems' ability to carry out data collection and reporting. Questions were also raised about funding for conservation related capital improvements and the possibility of public funds to help pay for conservation plan implementation.
 - 1. ACTION: Jim will provide State Revolving Fund rule and application documents on website.

IV. Major Issues and Concerns

- A. Subcommittee members were asked to write issues they thought of as critical on "post it" notes and place them on the appropriate topic from a general list of topics prepared by DOH. Discussion about the grouping of issues followed. DOH indicated that the results of this activity would be used to establish issue work groups and set their objectives.
 - a. ACTION: HSPA will document answers and e-mail them to the subcommittee
- B. Jim suggested that three work groups be formed to work on the following critical issues identified by the subcommittee.
 - 1. Data collection
 - 2. Performance reporting and accountability
 - Jim notes that he sees these issues under the compliance heading on the wall from the critical issues exercise.
 - 3. Cost effectiveness
- C. A question was raised about the MWL and its provisions regarding DOH's ability to mandate and enforce compliance. Jim stated that DOH is charged only with mandating a leakage standard and otherwise requiring utilities to define their own outcomes.

Clarification from Jim Rioux: DOH is directed to adopt rules for conservation

planning, water distribution system leakage, and performance reporting. Of those items, only the leakage standard is a specific numerical standard. DOH does have the authority and responsibility to ensure compliance with all three elements of the law.

1. Requirements vs. guidelines were discussed.
2. A subcommittee member commented that the SWSMPs (Small Water System Management Plans) appear to be ignored by DOH and asked whether or not the rule to be determined will apply to small water systems or just to those currently required to submit a water management plan?
 - a. Jim pointed to the MWL requirements regarding SWSMPs.
 - b. ACTION: Comment was added to under the compliance heading of critical issues.
3. Affordability and cost effectiveness were brought up by some group members. Jim stated that these issues would be dealt with by one of the work groups.

V. Public Comment Period

- A. Joan Burlingame of Ravensdale, WA asked the subcommittee to think about their grandchildren and the availability of water to them. She also said she saw the main question as how to create a system for all utilities so that will provide be a robust supply of water for businesses, homes and fish.

VI. Working Lunch

- A. The group discussed questions that arose after the April 28, 2004, meeting.
- B. Other agency guidelines were proposed.
 1. ACTION: Jennifer to get copies of EPA guidelines for the subcommittee
- C. Topic list for future meetings was reviewed

VII. Workgroup confirmation

- A. Jim reviewed the three proposed work groups (see above) and asked for approval to form the groups before the June 23 meeting.
 1. Data Collection
 - a. Some members felt that while the State Agency Technical Panel is an important resource for this ad hoc group, it is important that subcommittee members should also be included.

- i. ACTION: Data collection will become an ad hoc work group using the State Agency Technical Panel as a resource.
 - ii. ACTION: Denise Smith will draft language to reintroduce the State Agency Technical Panel into the charter for consideration.
- 2. Performance Reporting and Accountability
 - a. Compliance issues will fall under this work group's charge.
- 3. Cost Effectiveness

VIII. General Directional Statements

- A. The General Directional Statements from the Legislature Discussion Paper was reviewed and discussed.
 - 1. Question #1: The subcommittee discussed issues surrounding financial viability and affordability of supply. During the discussion some members expressed the concern that affordability of supplies was not adequately addressed and that there needs to be more in the report about looking to long-term sustainability of supply.
 - 2. Question #2: System size in relation to efficiency requirements was considered. Several members expressed the opinion that current size determinations were not adequate. Members also proposed that requirements be based on a combination of factors that would determine the size/category of the system, instead of based solely on the number of users/connections.
 - 3. Question #3: The subcommittee discussed different supply characteristics and how they should be incorporated into the regulation. Alternative supply sources were discussed, with the conversation focusing on conservation as a source of supply.
 - 4. Question #4: Characteristics of demand that should be considered in rule making were considered. Several members expressed the view that demand forecasting was critical to planning from the utility perspective, and that rates must be included in demand forecasting.
 - a. A member suggested that customer "class" was more important than customer "demographics" as stated in the discussion paper.
 - i. ACTION: Jim will change the language in question #4 to reflect customer class instead of demographic.
 - 5. The subcommittee was given work sheets for writing additional responses to the questions outlined in the discussion paper
 - a. ACTION: HSPA will transcribe the worksheets.

IX. Planning Directional Statements.

- A. Deana gave a presentation on the background of CPR and the Planning Directional Statements Discussion Paper, however discussion was delayed until the next meeting.

X. Public Comment – There was no public comment at this time.

XI. Meeting Wrap-up/Next Meeting Topics

- A. The following items will be considered for future meetings:
 - 1. A framework for education of alternative methods. Finding experts to attend has not been successful at this point.
 - 2. Tim Wilson will walk the group through the EPA planning guide.
 - 3. Andrew Graham will speak on guidance.
- B. Jim will prepare the following for the next meeting:
 - 1. Redrafted discussion papers
 - 2. Work group membership
 - 3. Copies of the AWWA planning guidance